



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/857,585	05/16/97	ABE	F WATK:040E

PARKHURST WENDEL & BURR
SUITE 210
1421 PRINCE STREET
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

A1M1/0818

EXAMINER	
PREISCH, N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1106	32

DATE MAILED: 08/18/97

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/857,585	Applicant(s) Abe et al.
Examiner Nadine Preisich	Group Art Unit 1106

Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 16, 1997

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-6 and 11-14 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-6 and 11-14 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 08/765,059.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1106

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-2, 4, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation of "Si/Al ratio" is indefinite because the units of the ratio are not defined. For instance, is the ratio an atomic ratio, a weight/weight ratio, etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over abstract (113:102645 CA) in view of Eberly, Jr. et al.(3,591,488).

Art Unit: 1106

In the pending application, applicants claim a composition comprising a high silica zeolite having a Si/Al ratio of not less than 40, and a heat resistant oxide, wherein the said heat resistant oxide is loaded with a noble metal. Applicants further claim an adsorbent comprising a honeycomb structure coated with a heat resistant oxide loaded with a noble metal.

Abstract (113:102645 CA) teaches a composition for automobile exhaust gas treatment comprising a zeolite and a heat resistant oxide in the form of alumina. The abstract also discloses that a noble metal in the form of Pt is loaded on alumina. For example, see abstract, lines 10-13. (113:102645 CA) also discloses that the support is honeycomb shaped. In addition, the support is coated with a heat resistant oxide in the form of alumina. For example, see abstract, lines 11-12.

Abstract (113:102645 CA) succeeds in teaching applicants' claimed zeolite component and heat resistant oxide component, other than zeolite, loaded with a noble metal in the form of alumina loaded with Pt. Furthermore, (113:102645 CA) also succeeds in teaching applicants' honeycomb shaped support.

Several differences are noted between the applied art of (113:102645 CA) and applicants' claimed invention. The abstract (113:102645 CA) is silent about the Si/Al ratio in the zeolite. Furthermore, (113:102645 CA) is silent about the specific structure of the honeycomb.

The reference of Eberly, Jr. et al.(3,591,488) is cited for the general teaching that it is known in the art that zeolites with that high silica/alumina ratios, such as 50, are desirable for high temperature conversions because they display increased thermal stability. For example, see column 2, lines 41-45 and column 5, lines 2-5.

Art Unit: 1106

Since it is desirable for compositions to be thermally stable for exhaust gas treatment process due to the high temperatures involved, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a zeolite with a high silica/alumina ratio in the exhaust gas composition disclosed by (113:102645 CA) because it is known in the art that zeolites with a high silica/alumina ratio display increased thermal stability.

Furthermore, applicants' limitations directed at the specific shape of the honeycomb composition are not considered to be patentable distinctions because such shapes are conventional in the art.

Therefore, applicants' claimed compositions fail to patentably distinguish over the applied prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadine Preisch whose telephone number is (703) 305-2667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

August 7, 1997
N.P.

Walter D. Griffin
WALTER D. GRIFFIN
EXAMINER
GROUP 1100

NP